UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,526	12/08/2006	Richard Spitz	10191/4608	9368
26646 KENYON & K	7590 12/21/201 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADV	VAY	HSIEH, HSIN YI		
NEW YORK, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/21/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/575,526	SPITZ ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
HSIN-YI HSIEH	2811

1	SIN-YI HSIEH	2811				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	s on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 November 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on th application, applicant must timely file one of the following repapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFI periods:	ilies: (1) an amendment, affidavi (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request				
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advino event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b).	than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sho set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	sion and the corresponding amount tened statutory period for reply original.	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complia	nce with 37 CFB 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extensi a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	on thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but	prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered because				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consi	•	TE below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	form for appeal by materially re-	ducing or simplifying the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a cor	responding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _	i. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s). 						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provid The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 15-23 and 26. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an explanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:	9/9B/99/1 aper 140(3).					
/LYNNE GURLEY/	/Hsin-Yi (Steven) Hsieh	n/				
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2811	Examiner, Art Unit 2811					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claim rejection set forth in the final rejection still stands.

On page 4 of Applicant's Response, Applicant argues that the Examiner's interpretation that either side of the sleeve wall 12 can be considered to be "exterior of the sleeve," is inherently incorrect because the sleeve 12 is a part of an enclosed structure (diode 100), and "interior" and "exterior" of the sleeve are inherently defined by the enclosure.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument, because "exterior" is defined by the sleeve 12 and is not defined by the enclosure as it is cited in the claim: "exterior of the sleeve." Thus either side of the sleeve wall 12 can be considered to be "exterior of the sleeve". It is also noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., enclosure) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).